DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 530 SP 032 846

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Preservice Teacher Evaluation.
PUB DATE 17 Dec 90
NOTE 70p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Followup Studies; Higher Education; *Interrater Reliability; Preservice Teacher Education; Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors

ABSTRACT

This follow-up study of student teachers contains data relative to the undergraduates' self-evaluation in the teaching-learning experience, and the assessments administered through the application of the same rating scale by the respective cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to the data in order to determine significant differences in the assessments made by the student teachers' self-evaluation and those made by the cooperating teachers and supervisors. In most instances, no significant differences were found for the three groups of evaluators. Some differences among the evaluators were found on student teacher's participation in school activities, punctuality, and ability to develop evaluation devices. Appendixes include 51 tables and the evaluative instruments. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328530

SP

PRESERVICE TEACHER EVALUATION

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER 17, 1990

SP 032 846

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. L. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 3

Research Design 4

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Analysis of Variance . . 5

The Level of Significance 6

Conclusion. 8

Appencix A. 9

Tables 1-25

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Appendix B. 35

Tables 26-50

The Analysis of Variance

Multiple Comparisons: Fisher's LSD

A Matrix of Probabilities

Appendix C. 61

Table 51

Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance

Appendix D. 65

The Evaluative Instruments

EVALUATING PRESERVICE TEACHERS

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 44 (n = 44) undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's teacher preparation program during Fall Semester of 1989 and 41 (n = 41) undergraduates during Spring semester of 1990 for a total of 85 (N = 85) undergraduates. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self evaluation regarding the ability to demonstrate twenty-five teaching competencies. In addition, the student teaching evaluations completed during the Fall of 1989 and the Spring of 1990 by the above undergraduates' cooperating teacher(s) (n = 62, Fall 1989 and n = 55, Spring 1990) and university supervisor (n = 47, Fall 1989 and n = 43, Spring 1990) were also included regarding the evaluation of the very same teaching-learning competencies.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of variance found existing among three different groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice teacher education students. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What does the application of the analysis of variance show regarding the student teachers' self-evaluation relative to the competencies related to the teaching-learning process?

2. What does the application of the analysis of variance illustrate relative to the performance of these same student teachers when measured with the same rating scale administered by their respective cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?
3. Are there any significant differences between the self-evaluation conducted by the student teachers, and the respective evaluations of these same student teachers by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors relative to the same competencies?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency (Appendix D).

At the end of student teaching, the student teacher, cooperating teacher,and university supervisor completed the rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. The data were obtained from the

above and tabulated and analyzed on the computer. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) lists the numbers on the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. In addition, the respondents were to check NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be check if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the number of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations relative to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Analysis of Variance

Tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) show the mean scores and standard deviations for the twenty-five competencies related to teaching as represented by the Fall, 1989 and Spring, 1990 student teachers. Mean scores were obtained in regards to the student teacher's perception of his/her competencies related to the teaching-learning process. Tables 26-50 (Appendix B) illustrate the multiple comparisons of the above three groups of evaluators as

provided through the application of the analysis of variance by using Fisher's levels of significant differences (LSD). A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency through the multiple comparisons provided in Fisher's LSD relative to the above groups of evaluators assessing the competence of the Fall 1989 and Spring 1990 student teachers.

The Level of Significance

Since a (p) value between 0.05 is usually thought of as marginally significant, anything greater was labeled in this study as a nonsignificant difference. Tables 26 through 50 (Appendix B) show the matrix of probabilities illustrated through the application of Fisher's multiple comparisons for each of the mean scores of Fall semester 1989 and Spring Semester 1990 to the mean scores derived from the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The variability which occurred within this study was depicted through taking into account the size and location of each individual score in terms of each respective mean score derived from the three groups of respondents. Table 51 (Appendix C) lists the differences found among and within the various mean scores. Fifty comparison were made by selecting the two most significant values derived on each of the twenty five competencies. It can readily be noticed that the assessments of the specific competencies in the student teaachers by the three groups of evaluators were significantly different in only five instances. Thus, no

significant differences were derived from the three different groups of evaluators in forty-five of the fifty comparisons. The five instances of significant differences were at or below the .05 level. These particular differences occurred while rating the student teacher on three of the twenty five competencies. Thus, there were no significant differences noted among all the evaluators when the student teachers were rated on the other twenty-two competencies.

Conclusion

The mean values derived from the application of the rating scale by the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors relative to the student teachers' ability to demonstrate competencies related to the teaching-learning process were in most instances not significantly different for the three groups of evaluators.

The greatest difference was found to exist between the evaluations derived from the student teachers and the evaluations obtained from the university supervisors (e.g. p =.003). This particular level of difference dealt with assessing the student teachers' participation in school activities. The level of .004) was derived between the cooperating teachers and the student teachers regarding this same competency of participating in school activities. The .03 level of significance was obtained relative to the student teachers and the university supervisors evaluation of the student teachers' punctuality. It was also found that student teachers and cooperating teachers differed at the .04 level of significance in measuring the student teachers' punctuality. An additional level of .04 was found regarding the differences between the cooperating teachers' and student teachers' assessment of the student teachers' ability to develop evaluation devices.

The above five instances were found where significant differences existed below the .05 level of significance. Those differences occurred while rating the student teachers on three of the twenty-five competencies. There were no significant differences noted among all the evaluators when the student teachers were rated on the other twenty-two competencies.

APPENDIX A
TABLES 1-25
THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

TABLE 1

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 1-PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	3	0	1
4	10	19	8	11	7	7
5	33	22	54	40	39	30
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	1	1	5
Mean	4.77	4.54	4.87	4.69	4.85	4.76
Standard						
Deviation	0.43	0.50	0.34	0.58	0.36	0.49

TABLE 2

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 2-MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	4	2	1	3	0	3
4	15	13	13	13	10	8
5	25	26	48	35	37	32
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.48	4.59	4.76	4.42	4.79	4.67
Standard						
Deviation	0.66	0.59	0.47	0.96	0.41	0.61

TABLE 3

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 3-CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO TEACH

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	4	4	3	6	1	2
4	18	19	18	15	19	19
5	22	18	41	31	27	21
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.41	4.34	4.61	4.35	4.55	4.45
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.89	0.54	0.59

TABLE 4

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 4-MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp.90 N=43
1	0	0	0	3	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	1
3	1	2	0	2	0	0
4	8	11	5	12	7	7
5	35	28	57	37	40	34
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.77	4.63	4.92	4.44	4.85	4.76
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.58	0.27	1.05	0.36	0.58

TABLE 5

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 5-COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN CLASSROOM

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	3	0	1
3	3	7	3	4	1	1
4	17	15	23	21	13	17
5	24	18	36	24	33	23
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	2	0	1
Mean	4.48	4.28	4.53	4.21	4.68	4.48
Standard Deviation	0.63	0.75	0.59	0.95	0.52	0.67

TABLE 6

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 6-PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	1	1
3	4	9	1	0	0	0
4	12	15	7	4	7	3
5	23	12	24	15	18	3
Competent						
NA	4	4	30	36	21	36
Mean	4.43	4.03	4.72	4.79	4.62	4.14
Standard Deviation	0.78	0.83	0.52	0.42	0.70	1.07

TABLE 7

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 7-REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	1	2	1	2	0	1
4	8	10	6	10	8	9
5	35	29	54	40	39	32
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	0	0	1
Mean	4.77	4.66	4.87	4.58	4.83	4.74
Standard						
Deviation	0.48	0.57	0.39	0.81	0.38	0.50

TABLE 8

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 8-PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp.90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	1
3	4	2	0	3	0	1
4	8	10	5	5	5	3
5	31	27	36	46	42	37
Competent						
NA	1	2	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.63	4.64	4.92	4.75	4.89	4.81
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.58	0.28	0.64	0.31	0.59

TABLE 9

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 9-PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	1	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	3	5	2	2	0	0
4	11	11	5	6	6	7
5	28	24	50	40	37	32
Competent						
NA	1	0	5	6	4	4
Mean	4.51	4.39	4.87	4.73	4.86	4.82
Standard						
Deviation	0.83	0.89	0.45	0.64	0.35	0.39

TABLE 10

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 10-USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	1	0	0
3	2	3	0	4	1	2
4	12	14	9	13	17	14
5	29	24	52	37	29	27
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean	4.57	4.51	4.85	4.56	4.60	4.58
Standard Deviation	0.70	0.64	0.36	0.71	0.54	0.59

TABLE 11

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 11-DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	1	0	0	2	0	1
3	4	6	3	6	0	3
4	15	18	14	21	14	14
5	23	17	43	25	31	24
Competent						
NA	1	0	2	0	2	1
Mean	4.40	4.27	4.67	4.22	4.69	4.45
Standard Deviation	0.76	0.71	0.57	0.92	0.47	0.74

TABLE 12

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 12-DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	0	2	0	0
3	4	4	3	5	1	3
4	12	17	19	15	11	14
5	25	20	40	33	35	26
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.40	4.39	4.60	4.44	4.72	4.53
Standard Deviation	0.85	0.67	0.59	0.81	0.50	0.63

TABLE 13

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 13-OBTAIN APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	6	1	2	1	2
4	15	17	8	15	13	15
5	27	18	53	37	33	26
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.55	4.29	4.84	4.60	4.68	4.56
Standard						
Deviation	0.66	0.72	0.41	0.66	0.52	0.59

TABLE 14

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 14-CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	1
3	4	7	3	7	1	2
4	17	19	15	16	16	20
5	22	15	44	31	29	20
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.42	4.20	4.66	4.40	4.61	4.37
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.71	0.57	0.78	0.54	0.69

BLANK PAGE

TABLE 15

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 15-PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	4	4	3	3	0	1
4	19	22	18	19	22	19
5	21	15	41	30	25	22
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.39	4.27	4.61	4.38	4.53	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.65	0.63	0.58	0.83	0.50	0.55

TABLE 16

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 16-MANAGES CLASSROOM FACILITIES EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	3	1	5	0	1
4	17	20	14	17	14	14
5	26	18	47	31	33	28
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.57	4.37	4.74	4.38	4.70	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.55	0.62	0.48	0.87	0.46	0.54

TABLE 17

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 17-MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	2	0	0
2	0	1	0	2	0	3
3	5	7	5	8	0	0
4	19	20	26	23	26	21
5	20	13	31	20	21	19
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.34	4.10	4.42	4.04	4.45	4.30
Standard Deviation	0.68	0.77	0.64	1.00	0.50	0.80

TABLE 18

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 18-DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	0	0
3	7	6	0	8	0	3
4	13	18	17	12	21	14
5	22	16	43	31	25	25
Competent						
NA	2	1	1	4	1	1
Mean	4.36	4.25	4.67	4.45	4.54	4.52
Standard Deviation	0.76	0.71	0.57	0.76	0.50	0.63

TABLE 19

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 19-ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N= 62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	3	0	0
3	7	3	1	6	0	3
4	10	22	14	17	16	12
5	26	15	45	28	30	28
Competent						
NA	1	1	2	1	1	0
Mean	4.44	4.30	4.73	4.30	4.65	4.58
Standard Deviation	0.77	0.61	0.48	0.88	0.48	0.63

TABLE 20

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 20-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	3	1	2	5	1	1
4	10	12	3	9	16	8
5	23	16	45	27	28	19
Competent						
NA	8	12	12	14	2	15
Mean	4.56	4.52	4.86	4.54	4.60	4.64
Standard Deviation	0.65	0.57	0.45	0.71	0.54	0.56

TABLE 21

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 21-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teaches		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp.90	Fall 89	Sp. 90
	N=44	N=41	N=62	N=55	N=47	N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	0	0	0
3	3	4	2	7	1	0
4	14	11	10	14	18	10
5	23	22	44	23	26	24
Competent						
NA	3	4	6	11	1	9
Mean	4.44	4.49	4.75	4.36	4.56	4.71
Standard						
Deviation	0.74	0.69	0.51	0.75	0.55	0.46

TABLE 22

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 22-DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	1	0	4	0	0
2	0	0	1	1	0	1
3	1	1	3	3	0	3
4	9	10	9	14	12	8
5	34	28	48	33	35	31
Competent						
NA	0	1	1	0	0	0
Mean	4.75	4.60	4.70	4.29	4.74	4.60
Standard Deviation	0.49	0.78	0.64	1.15	0.44	0.73

TABLE 23

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 23-COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	4	2	3	1	0	3
4	17	19	12	17	15	9
5	22	16	43	25	31	28
Competent						
NA	1	4	4	10	1	3
Mean	4.42	4.38	4.69	4.42	4.67	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.59	0.57	0.84	0.47	0.63

TABLE 24

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 24-COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	1	0	1
3	0	1	1	4	1	1
4	5	10	4	5	8	5
5	38	28	57	44	37	35
Competent						
NA	0	2	0	1	1	1
Mean	4.82	4.69	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.76
Standard Deviation	0.54	0.52	0.35	0.69	0.47	0.62

TABLE 25

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 25-MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL, OPEN MINDEDNESS, FLEXIBILITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 89 N=44	Sp.90 N=41	Fall 89 N=62	Sp.90 N=55	Fall 89 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	0	2	4	0	0
4	7	10	3	11	8	6
5	35	29	55	40	39	37
Competent						
NA	0	2	2	0	0	0
Mean	4.75	4.74	4.88	4.65	4.83	4.86
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.44	0.42	0.62	0.38	0.35

APPENDIX B
TABLES 26-50
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD
MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

TABLE 26

PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.357	*.274
Cooperating Teachers	**.357	1.000	.841
University Supervisors	*.274	.841	1.000

*p< .274 or .24 level of significance

**p< .357 or .35 level of significance

TABLE 27

MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.731	*.251
Cooperating Teachers	.731	1.000	**.406
University Supervisors	*.251	**.406	1.000

*p< .251 or .25 level of significance

**p< .406 or .41 level of significance

TABLE 28

CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO TEACH

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.413	*.329
Cooperating Teachers	**.413	1.000	.864
University Supervisors	*.329	.864	1.000

*p< .329 or .33 level of significance

**p< .413 or .41 level of significance

TABLE 29

MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.923	**.634
Cooperating Teachers	.923	1.000	*.573
University Supervisors	**.634	*.573	1.000

*p< .573 or .57 level of significance

**p< .634 or .63 level of significance

TABLE 30

COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN THE CLASSROOM

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.955	**.295
Cooperating Teachers	.955	1.000	*.274
University Supervisors	**.295	*.274	1.000

*p< .274 or .27 level of significance

**p< .295 or.30 level of significance

TABLE 31

PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.085	.584
Cooperating Teachers	*.085	1.000	**.193
University Supervisors	.584	**.193	1.000

*p< .083 or .08 level of significance

**p< .193 or.19 level of significance

TABLE 32

REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.940	*.618
Cooperating Teachers	.940	1.000	**.667
University Supervisors	*.618	**.667	1.000

*p< .618 or .62 level of significance

**p< .667 or.67 level of significance

TABLE 33

PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.040	*.031
Cooperating Teachers	**.040	1.000	.845
University Supervisors	*.031	.845	1.000

*p< .031 or .03 level of significance

**p< .040 or.04 level of significance

TABLE 34

PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.004	*.003
Cooperating Teachers	**.004	1.000	.625
University Supervisors	*.003	.625	1.000

*p< .003 or .00 level of significance

**p< .004 or.00 level of significance

TABLE 35

USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.221	.694
Cooperating Teachers	*.221	1.000	**.390
University Supervisors	.694	**.390	1.000

*p< .221 or .22 level of significance

**p< .390 or.39 level of significance

TABLE 36

DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.630	*.317
Cooperating Teachers	.630	1.000	**.586
University Supervisors	*.317	**.586	1.000

*p< .317 or .32 level of significance

**p< .586 or.59 level of significance

TABLE 37

DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.264	*.063
Cooperating Teachers	**.264	1.000	.342
University Supervisors	*.063	.342	1.000

*p< .063 or .06 level of significance

**p< .264 or.26 level of significance

TABLE 38

OBTAINS APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.095	**.237
Cooperating Teachers	*.095	1.000	.541
University Supervisors	**.237	.541	1.000

*p< .095 or .10 level of significance

**p< .237 or.24 level of significance

TABLE 39

CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.243	**.332
Cooperating Teachers	*.243	1.000	.816
University Supervisors	**.332	.816	1.000

*p< .243 or .24 level of significance

**p< .332 or.33 level of significance

TABLE 40

PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.171	*.132
Cooperating Teachers	**.171	1.000	.851
University Supervisors	*.132	.851	1.000

*p< .132 or .13 level of significance

**p< .171 or.17 level of significance

TABLE 41

MANAGES CLASSROOMS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.799	*.396
Cooperating Teachers	.799	1.000	**.529
University Supervisors	*.396	**.529	1.000

*p< .396 or .40 level of significance

**p< .529 or.53 level of significance

TABLE 42

MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.959	*.459
Cooperating Teachers	.959	1.000	**.487
University Supervisors	*.459	**.487	1.000

*p< .459 or .46 level of significance

**p< .487 or.49 level of significance

TABLE 43

DEVELOPS APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.044	**.066
Cooperating Teachers	*.044	1.000	.771
University Supervisors	**.066	.771	1.000

*p< .044 or .04 level of significance

**p< .066 or.07 level of significance

TABLE 44

ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.472	*.237
Cooperating Teachers	**.472	1.000	.615
University Supervisors	*.237	.615	1.000

*p< .237 or .24 level of significance

**p< .472 or.47 level of significance

TABLE 45

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.273	**.573
Cooperating Teachers	*.273	1.000	**.573
University Supervisors	**.573	**.573	1.000

*p< .273 or .27 level of significance

**p< .573 or.57 level of significance

TABLE 46

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.623	*.374
Cooperating Teachers	**.623	1.000	.660
University Supervisors	*.374	.660	1.000

*p< .374 or .37 level of significance

**p< .623 or.62 level of significance

TABLE 47

DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.385	1.000
Cooperating Teachers	*.385	1.000	**.396
University Supervisors	1.000	**.396	1.000

*p< .385 or .39 level of significance

**p< .396 or.40 level of significance

TABLE 48

COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.217	*.067
Cooperating Teachers	**.217	1.000	.437
University Supervisors	*.067	.437	1.000

*p< .067 or .07 level of significance

**p< .217 or.22 level of significance

TABLE 49

COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.663	.877
Cooperating Teachers	*.663	1.000	**.765
University Supervisors	.877	**.765	1.000

*p< .663 or .66 level of significance

**p< .765 or.77 level of significance

TABLE 50

MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL OPEN-MINDEDNESS, AND FLEXIBILITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.833	*.333
Cooperating Teachers	.833	1.000	**.437
University Supervisors	*.333	**.437	1.000

*p< .333 or .33 level of significance

**p< .437 or .44 level of significance

APPENDIX C
TABLE 51
SUMMARY TABLE LISTING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

TABLE 51

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Practices Professional Ethics	.24	University Super. - Student Teacher
Practices Professional Ethics	.35	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Maintains Enthusiasm	.25	University Super. - Student Teacher
Maintains Enthusiasm	.41	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.33	University Super. - Student Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.41	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Appearance	.57	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Appearance	.63	University Super. - Student Teacher
Communicates Effectively	.27	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Communicates Effectively	.30	University Super. - Student Teacher
Professional Organizations	.08	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Organizations	.19	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.62	University Super. - Student Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.67	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.03	University Super. - Student Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.04	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
School Activities	.003	University Super. - Student Teacher
School Activities	.004	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Resources for Development	.22	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Resources for Development	.39	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.32	University Super. - Student Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.59	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Develops Lesson Plans	.06	University Super. - Student Teacher
Develops Lesson Plans	.26	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.10	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.24	University Super. - Student Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.24	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.33	University Super. - Student Teacher
Presents Lesson Effectively	.13	University Super. - Student Teacher
Presents Lesson Effectively	.17	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Manages Classroom Facilities	.40	University Super. - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Facilities	.53	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.46	University Super. - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.49	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.04	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.07	University Super. - Student Teacher
Assesses Student Progress	.24	University Super. - Student Teacher
Assesses Student Progress	.47	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.27	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.57	University Super. - Student Teacher
Work with Exceptional Students	.37	University Super. - Student Teacher
Work with Exceptional Students	.62	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Develops Rapport	.39	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Develops Rapport	.40	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.07	University Super. - Student Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.22	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Cooperates with School	.66	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Cooperates with School	.77	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Personal Behavior	.33	University Super. - Student Teacher
Personal Behavior	.44	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher

APPENDIX D
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____Semester_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Student's Signature

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____Semester_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Cooperating Teacher

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____Semester_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
University Supervisor